

Hello,

I'd prefer not to have <formations> as another direct child-element of the <railml> root element. So I'm in favour of the second option.

But what about separating vehicle and train related data by means of two new container elements? I mean something like this:

```
railml --- rollingstock --- vehicles --- rs      <= vehicle related
      |
      -- formations --- formation   <= train related
```

The naming of these container elements (<vehicles> and <formations>) would have to be discussed probably (or shall we rename <rs> to <vehicle>?)

This version would be similar as we have it in the infrastructure (container elements lines, tracks, operationControlPoints, etc.)

Other opinions?

Best regards,
Matthias Hengartner

"Joerg von Lingen" <jvl@bahntechnik.de> wrote in message
news:GlwwHj9GEHA.1168@sifa...

> Hallo,

>

> as briefly described during meeting in Brunswick the latest version of
rollingstock scheme is 0.93

> with the major addition of train related data in <formation> branch.

However, it is still possible

> to discuss the best "mounting point" of this branch:

> 1. railml --- rollingstock --- rs <= vehicle related

>

> |
> -- formations --- formation <= train related

> *or*

> 2. railml --- rollingstock --- rs <= vehicle related

>

> |
> -- formation <= train related

>

- > Please give me your opinions.
 - >
 - > Best,
 - > Joerg von Lingen
-